

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Appl. No. 09/650,329

Amdt. dated January 12, 2006

Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2005

PATENT**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

**Interview:** The Applicants thank the Examiner for her courtesy and consideration in discussing this Application in a telephone interview on January 12, 2006. The claims were discussed in light of certain proposed amendments. Although no final agreement was reached, there was agreement on a number of key areas. The claims, as amended herein, are drafted to reflect the suggestions of the Examiner regarding possible claim amendments.

**Amendments:** Before this Amendment, claims 4, 7-9, 13, and 16-26 were present for examination. Claims 4, 13, 20, and 24 are amended. Therefore, claims 4, 7-9, 13, and 16-26 are present for examination, and claims 4, 13, 20, and 24 are the independent claims. No new matter is added by these amendments. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended.

The Office Action dated October 18, 2005 ("Office Action") rejected claims 4, 7-9, 13, and 16-26 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Office Action rejected claims 4, 7-9, 13 and 16-26 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

**35 U.S.C. §112, Rejection/Maturity Reference**

As noted, the Office Action rejected claims 4, 7-9, 13, and 16-26 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Specifically, the Office Action maintained that there is no support in the Specification to claim that the receiver circuit can perform synchronization *without utilizing the microprocessor*.

Independent claims 4, 13, 20, and 24 have been amended to remove the limitation providing that synchronization be performed *without utilizing the microprocessor*. The amended claims recite that the "receiver circuit, decoder circuit, and microprocessor each comprise separate nodes of a bus in the host computer." Support for the amendment can be found in the Specification (Application, p. 3, l. 24 - p. 4, l. 3; Fig. 1).

The amended claims further recite that the *receiver circuit* captures a system time clock (STC) timestamp, and adjusts STC frequency based on a comparison between the STC and

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Appl. No. 09/650,329

Amdt. dated January 12, 2006

Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2005

PATENT

a program clock reference (PCR) timestamp. Support for the amendment can be found in the Specification (Application, p. 4, l. 31 - p. 5, l. 23).

The Office previously rejected the claims in light of the cited portions of Maturi, et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,559,999 (hereinafter "Maturi"). But in Maturi these functions are not performed by a separate receiver circuit, as called for in the claims. Maturi provides that "[i]n response to a first interrupt from the pre-parser 22 which results from storing a PES header in the header buffer 20a or 20c, the microcontroller 18 reads the counter 38 to obtain a value SCRO" (Maturi, col. 8, ll. 6-10). Thus, in Maturi, "a host controller ... sets the system clock timer counting" (*Id.*, col. 3, ll. 40-42).

As noted in the Specification, there are "critical timing constraints ... for proper decoding and presentation of digital video frames" (Application, p. 2, ll. 1-3). One problem that can arise with systems such as Maturi is that "as packets are passed ... for processing, uncertainties in the hardware and software timing accumulate" (*Id.*, p. 5, ll. 4-6). The present invention addresses timing issues by having a separate receiver circuit capture the timestamp, not the microcontroller, which may thereby result in more accurate timing information.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the specified limitations in independent claims 4, 13, 20, and 24 are not taught or suggested in Maturi, and that these claims are allowable for at least the foregoing reasons. Claims 7-9, 16-19, 21-23, 25, and 26 each depend from these independent claims, and are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as given above.

**Objections**

The Office Action objected to use of the term "digital video host system" and raised objections related to the antecedent basis of "the transmitter." The claims have been amended to address these concerns.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Appl. No. 09/650,329

Amtd. dated January 12, 2006

Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2005

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael L. Drapkin  
Reg. No. 55,127

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 303-571-4000  
Fax: 415-576-0300

MLD:klb  
60621898 v.1